

REMARKS

Applicant is amending independent Claims 1, 2, 27 and 28 to correct informalities therein. No new matter is being added. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 12-13, 15, 27-28, 30-31, 33, 38-39 and 41

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 12-13, 15, 27-28, 30-31, 33, 38-39 and 41 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moya et al. (US 6,469,405) in view of Yamada et al. (US 5,990,629). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claims 1, 2, 27, and 28 specifically recite that the thin film transistor is operated in a saturation region.

As the Examiner admits, Yamada does not disclose this claimed feature. The Examiner then cites Moya for allegedly teaching this feature. Moya, however, discloses a FET which is operated in a saturation region. At page 3, lines 6-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that "rationale same property or behavior of having a constant drain current when operating in a saturation region in both TFT and FET." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention.

In particular, a thin film transistor does not use a silicon substrate, but a FET needs a silicon substrate as a channel layer. This structural difference clearly distinguishes a thin film transistor from a FET, since this structural difference leads to the differences in the characteristics (for

example, threshold voltage and mobility) between a thin film transistor and a FET. Hence, since there are clear differences in characteristics and structure between the two devices, one skilled in the art would not substitute a teaching regarding a FET for a thin film transistor as there would be no expectation of success for such a modification. See e.g. MPEP §2143.02.

Further, Moya teaches a constant current driver having the FET operated in a saturation region. In contrast, independent Claims 1, 2, 27, and 28 of the present application recite a pixel having a thin film transistor which is operated in a saturation region. The above claimed matter suppresses the unevenness of luminance display due to the unevenness of the characteristics of TFTs or due to variations in the environmental temperature in order to perform accurate gray scale display. In contrast, Applicant respectfully submits that it is difficult to form a FET in the pixel because a FET needs a silicon substrate.

Therefore, as explained above, the combination of Moya into Yamada is improper as one skilled in the art would not modify, and there is no motivation to modify, a thin film transistor with a teaching about a FET. Further, since Moya does not disclose or suggest a thin film transistor operated in a saturation region, the claimed invention cannot be obtained even if it were proper to combine Moya and Yamada. Furthermore, there is no motivation to incorporate the FET of Moya into a pixel of Yamada, because a thin film transistor does not use a silicon substrate, but a FET needs a silicon substrate as a channel layer.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection is improper, and that independent Claims 1, 2, 27 and 28 are patentable over the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 8-9, 14, 16-17, 32, 34-35, 40 and 42-43

The Examiner also rejects Claims 6, 8-9, 14, 16-17, 32, 34-35, 40 and 42-43 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of Moya and further in view of Gates et al. (US 6,704,133). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

As each of these claims is a dependent claim, these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is adding new dependent Claims 53-60. As each of these claims is a dependent claim, these claims are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

It is not believed that a fee is due for these new claims. If any fee is due, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.


Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, Ltd.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 26568